UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/490,772	01/24/2000	Reinhard Heinrich Hohensee	IBMN.004US01 (0511)	7611

7590 05/18/2006

Chambliss, Bahner & Stophel, P.C.
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402

EXAMINER	
PARK, CHAN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/490,772	HOHENSEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAN S. PARK	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,44-52,54-56,58-60,62,63 and 65-68* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,44-52,54-56,58-60,62,63 and 65-68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Chan S. Park

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 2/23/06, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-18, 44-52, 54-56, 58-60, 62, 63 and 65-68** are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-18, 44-52, 54-56, 58-60, 62, 63 and 65-68** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

The following quotations of 37 § CFR 1.75(d)(1) is the basis of objection:

> (d)(1) The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description so that the meaning of the terms in the claims my be ascertainable by reference to the description. (See § 1.58(a)).

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the printer" at the end of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 11-13, 44 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,094,278 (hereinafter Smith) in view of Herriot U.S. Patent No. 6,134,583.

4. With respect to claim 1, Smith teaches a method for enabling re-use of presentation objects by a printing system (col. 4, lines 7-12), comprising:

identifying in a print data stream (col. 1, lines 18-22) a presentation object for printing within a page by the printing system according to a unique identifier assigned to the presentation object (col. 5, lines 27-30), and

capturing the presentation object having the assigned globally-unique identifier at the printing system (col. 5, lines 12-21).

Smith, however, does not teach expressly that the identifier is a globally unique identifier.

Herriot, the same field of endeavor of enabling re-use of presentation objects, teaches the method of using the globally unique identifier to identify objects (col. 22, lines 49-55 & col. 23, lines 19-20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the globally unique identifier method of Herriot into the printing system of Smith.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a globally-unique identifier to distinctly name a particular object in the network environment (col. 10, lines 32-40 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

5. With respect to claim 2, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object allows the object to be securely and correctly referenced for re-use (col. 10, lines 32-40).

6. With respect to claim 3, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object is platform-independent (col. 23, lines 16-18).

7. With respect to claim 4, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier is based upon an ISO administered global naming tree (col. 10, lines 41-60).

8. With respect to claim 5, Herriot teaches the method, wherein the globally-unique identifier is contained in a syntax structure of a data stream (col. 9, lines 37-44 & col. 10, lines 35-40).

9. With respect to claim 6, Herriot teaches that the document is made up of mixed object data (col. 4, lines 46-56 of Herriot). Therefore, the reference teaches the limitations of the invention as specified in claim 6.

10. With respect to claim 7, Herriot teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises:

requesting, in an ISO administered global naming tree, a first node for an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56);

registering, under the first node, a second node for each license of the application ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58); and

assigning a globally-unique identifier for the object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the globally-unique identifier including an indication of the object, the first node and the second node (col. 10, lines 41-58).

11. With respect to claim 8, Herriot teaches the assigning a globally unique identifier further comprises generating a globally-unique identifier for an object (col. 10, lines 32-40 & col. 22, lines 47-64), the generated globally-unique identifier includes an indication of a first node representing an application that uses the object (ISO in col. 10, lines 54-56), of a second node for each license of the application and of the object ("registration authority" in col. 10, lines 56-58).

12. With respect to claim 11, both Herriot and Smith do not explicitly teach the indication of object including a checksum value. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that including a checksum in a data representing the object is well known in the art.

According to the Hansen dictionary, checksum is commonly used to determine the integrity of data that has been received.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to use checksum value described in the dictionary to determine whether the data has been accurately received by the client computer of Herriot.

13. With respect to claim 12, Herriot teaches that the indication of the object includes a binary counter (col. 13, lines 19-33).

14. With respect to claim 13, Smith teaches a method for managing presentation objects for multiple use, comprising:

downloading to a printer a presentation object (col. 5, lines 12-21) for printing in a page and identified in a print data stream (col. 4, lines 7-12), the presentation object having a previously assigned unique identifier (col. 5, lines 27-30);

caching the presentation object in a cache of the printer when the presentation object is downloaded (col. 3, lines 29-30); and

capturing the presentation object having the previously assigned globally-unique identifier in memory of the printer (col. 5, lines 12-13).

Smith, however, does not teach expressly that the identifier is a globally unique identifier.

Herriot, the same field of endeavor of enabling re-use of presentation objects, teaches the method of using the globally unique identifier to identify objects (col. 22, lines 49-55 & col. 23, lines 19-20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the globally unique identifier method of Herriot into the printing system of Smith.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a globally-unique identifier to distinctly name a particular object in the network environment (col. 10, lines 32-40 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

15. With respect to claim 44, Smith discloses for managing presentation objects for multiple use, comprising:

a printer cache (RAM 40) for caching a presentation object for printing in a page and identified in a print data stream (col. 3, lines 29-31 & col. 4, lines 8-12), the presentation object having a previously assigned unique identifier; and

printer capture storage for capturing the presentation object having the previously assigned unique identifier (col. 5, lines 13-21).

Smith, however, does not teach expressly that the identifier is a globally unique identifier.

Herriot, the same field of endeavor of enabling re-use of presentation objects, teaches the method of using the globally unique identifier to identify objects (col. 22, lines 49-55 & col. 23, lines 19-20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the globally unique identifier method of Herriot into the printing system of Smith.

The motivation/suggestion for doing so would have been to provide a globally-unique identifier to distinctly name a particular object in the network environment (col. 10, lines 32-40 of Herriot).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Smith with Herriot to obtain the invention as specified in claim 44.

16. With respect to claim 67, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13, are applicable.

Claims 50, 54, 55, 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeClair et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,636,891 (hereinafter LeClair) in view of Shimada et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,980,310 (hereinafter Shimada).

17. With respect to claim 50, LeClair discloses a system for processing referenced objects (figs. 5 & 7), comprising:

a print server (print server 710) for searching for a presentation object for printing in a page (col. 10, lines 4-9) and referenced by a selected indicia in a print stream (col. 9, lines 18-29), the selected indicia being a previously assigned name, a globally-unique identifier (URL col. 10, lines 4-9) or globally-unique identifier and object locator, the print server downloading the presentation object identified in the print data stream (col. 10, lines 10-29), the presentation object having a previously assigned globally-unique identifier (col. 10, lines 4-9); and

a control unit for capturing the presentation object in memory of the printer (it is noted that it is inherent to include a memory in a printer to receive print data from the print server);

wherein the control unit captures the presentation object based upon the presentation object having the selected indicia (col. 10, lines 4-9).

LeClair, however, does not disclose explicitly that the memory is persistent storage (note the Examiner interprets "persistent storage" as a permanent storage).

Shimada, the same field of endeavor of the printing art, discloses a printer having a permanent storage for storing downloaded print data (col. 3, lines 48-53).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the permanent storage in the printer of LeClair.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to store the received/downloaded data in the printer permanently.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine LeClair with Shimada to obtain the invention as specified in claim 50.

18. With respect to claim 54, LeClair discloses the system wherein the control unit references the object by the globally-unique identifier (col. 10, lines 4-9).

19. With respect to claim 55, LeClair discloses the system wherein the print server attempts to find the object resident in the presentation device using the globally-unique identifier (col. 10, lines 4-9).

20. With respect to claim 58, LeClair discloses the system wherein the data stream references the object by the globally-unique identifier and object locator (col. 9, lines 30-41).

21. With respect to claim 59, LeClair discloses the system wherein the print server attempts to find the object by searching for a resident globally-unique identifier (col. 10, lines 4-9).

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of LeClair and Shimada as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Matsuyama U.S. Patent No. 6,330,068.

22. With respect to claim 56, Matsuyama discloses a print system wherein a print server searches for the resource inline (other print servers in network) when the search for a resident globally identifier fails (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46). It would have been obvious to implement the searching method of Matsuyama into the system of LeClair. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to access other servers/database in finding the desired objects.

Claims 60, 62, 63, 65 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of LeClair and Shimada as applied to claim 59 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

23. With respect to claim 60, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 56, are applicable.

24. With respect to claim 62, Matsuyama discloses a print system wherein a print server looks for the object by object locator in a resource library (image server 102) when the inline search is unsuccessful (col. 15, lines 39-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

25. With respect to claim 63, LeClair discloses the print server that determines whether the globally-unique identifier assigned to the object matches the globally unique identifier referenced (col. 10, lines 4-29).

26. With respect to claim 65, Matsuyama discloses that an indication of an error is provided if the identifier assigned to the object does not match the identifier referenced (image object not found in any of the print server in col. 15, lines 29-44 and col. 19, lines 39-46).

27. With respect to claim 66, Matsuyama discloses the print server for checking whether the object contain a globally-unique identifier. Note that when the identifier is not contain in the image it assigns one the object at step S1111. Additionally, Matsuyama discloses a display for displaying system running state (col. 8, lines 33-37). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to notify the user when the object is not stored within system by analyzing the presence of the identifier.

Claims 51 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of LeClair and Shimada as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of Maeda et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,791,703 (hereinafter Maeda).

28. With respect to claim 51, the combination discloses the system of claim 50, but it does not disclose explicitly that the data stream references the object by an object name and the print server searches for the object by the object name.

Maeda, the same field of endeavor of the network printing using URL, discloses URL specifying the name of the object to be retrieved in the network (col. 7, lines 13-17).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to specify the name of the object to be retrieved using URL.

29. With respect to claim 52, LeClair discloses the system wherein the pint server attempts to find the object resident in a presentation device when the object is referenced with the globally-unique identifier (col. 10, lines 4-9).

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Smith and Herriot as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hoover et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,724,575 (hereinafter Hoover).

30. With respect to claim 9, the combination teaches the method of claim 8, but it does not teach explicitly that the indication of the object includes a time stamp wherein the time stamp includes an indication of the date and time.

Hoover, the same field of endeavor of managing the database using object identifier art, teaches the method of indicating an object using time stamp wherein the time stamp includes an indication of the date and time (col. 24, line 6 – col. 25, line 7).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the time stamp in the object identifier of Smith and Herriot.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide information as to when the object is updated pertaining to a particular object identifier using the time stamp method.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9 and 10.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Smith and Herriot as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Shimada.

31. With respect to claim 14, the combination teaches the method of claim 13 but it does not teach explicitly that the memory comprises permanent storage.

Shimada, the same field of endeavor of the printing art, discloses a printer having a permanent storage for storing downloaded print data (col. 3, lines 48-53).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the permanent storage in the printer of Smith.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to store the received/downloaded data in the printer permanently.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Claims 15-18 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Smith and Herriot.

32. With respect to claims 15-18, the combination does not teach expressly the method of deleting non-active, least recently used, largest or smallest objects first. However, as previously cited in the Office action dated 2/26/04, Examiner takes Official Notice that setting a priority based on the size of the data and deleting based on the priority set by the user is well known in the memory management art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to set the memory management device delete one of non-active, largest or smallest objects based on the user defined parameter to increase the availability of the memory. Without deleting the previously captured objects in the finite memory, overflow in the memory will occur.

33. With respect to claim 68, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 15, are applicable.

Claims 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Smith and Herriot as applied to claim 44 above, and further in view of Matsuyama.

34. With respect to claims 45-47, the combination discloses the system of claim 44, but it does not explicitly disclose system comprising a print server, the print server deleting previously captured objects in the printer capture storage.

Matsuyama, the same field of the network printing art, discloses a printer server wherein the print server deletes previously captured objects in the printer capture storage (col. 7, lines 35-39).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to delete the previously captured objects in the printer capture storage of Smith to increase the memory availability for the next incoming print data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claims 45-47.

35. With respect to claim 48, Matsuyama discloses the system comprising a printer control unit for marking deleted objects in capture storage as removable (marking the discard time in col. 17, lines 30-35).

36. With respect to claim 49, Matsuyama discloses the removable object is deleted when a capture request is received to make storage available to capture a new resource (col. 17, lines 30-35).

Conclusion

37. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S. PARK whose telephone number is (571) 272-7409. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

csp
May 10, 2006

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER